

# Papers in Translation Studies

on and similar papers at [core.ac.uk](http://core.ac.uk)

---

br



# Papers in Translation Studies

Edited by

Sattar Izwaini

Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing



Papers in Translation Studies

Edited by Sattar Izwaini

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Sattar Izwaini and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7228-8

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7228-7

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	vii
Sattar Izwaini	

## **Part I: Translation and Linguistics, Ideology, Language Planning and Policy**

The Influence of Context on the Translation of Modal Particles.....	2
Steven Schoonjans	

The Role of Ideology in Translation: A Study of the Kurdish Media .....	24
Sabir Hasan Birot	

Turkish Translations of <i>Hamlet</i> : Observing Language Planning through Social Systems Theory Perspective.....	47
Hilal Erkazanci Durmus	

Translating for the Minorities in Wales: A Look at Translation Policies ..	70
Gabriel González Núñez	

## **Part II: Translator Training**

Exploring Social Translation and Ethics in the Classroom: Some Implications for Translator Training .....	96
María del Mar Sánchez Ramos	

Assessing University Students' Aptitude for Simultaneous Interpretation .....	113
Ahmed AlKilabi	

## **Part III: Corpus-based Translation Studies, NLP and Machine Translation**

Influence of Translation on Modern Chinese: A Case Study of RMs .....	132
Qiurong Zhao and Kefei Wang	

Tracing English Equivalents of Brazilian Portuguese Cooking Vocabulary: A Corpus-based Study .....	154
Rozane Rodrigues Rebechi	
Improving Named Entity Translations by Exploiting Non-parallel Corpora.....	179
Rahma Sellami, Fatiha Sadat and Lamia Hadrach Belguith	
A New Translation Technology: Impact of Automatic Summarisation on the Translation of Research Articles.....	199
María Cristina Toledo Báez	
Obstacles Facing Arabic Machine Translation: Building a Neural Network-based Transfer Module .....	229
Rached Zantout and Ahmed Guessoum	
Contributors.....	254

# INTRODUCTION

This book presents cutting-edge research in translation studies, offering stimulating discussions on translation and providing fresh perspectives on the field. It shows how research in translation studies has evolved and has been applied in some of its subareas. *Papers in Translation Studies* features a selection of papers originally authored for this volume, addressing a variety of issues from different points of view and offering interesting contributions to critical literature of the field. They represent the latest theoretical as well as methodological developments in their respective areas and offer a genuine view of contemporary translation studies.

The volume is an addition to the thriving literature on translation studies. It comes in a time when translation studies has flourished as a discipline with academic programs offered around the globe, as well as international conferences, seminars, and workshops especially dedicated to translation. Researching and teaching translation always require more and new additions in the form of research conducted by those in the know who can offer through their publications insights and stimulating thoughts and findings.

This collection of papers provides useful resources and a selection of topics that will be of great benefit for researchers, academics, students and practitioners. The contributions to this volume offer food for thought, which promotes research on translation theory and practice, and suggest ways of dealing with translation problems while tendering answers to research questions. The volume chapters are written by academics and researchers from around the world, dealing with different languages and contexts. They investigate translation from and into a wide range of languages including Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Kurdish, Portuguese, Spanish and Turkish. Areas of investigation range from contrastive linguistics and translation to natural language processing and machine translation as well as translator training.

The book is divided into three parts. Part One consists of four chapters that deal with issues in and related to translation such as linguistics, ideology, language planning and policy. The two chapters of Part Two focus on translator training, which is a significant area in teaching and

practicing translation. The papers in Part Three, five in number, examine issues in corpus-based translation studies, NLP and machine translation.

In the first part section of the book, Steven Schoonjans presents an interesting and informative discussion of the influence of context on the translation of modal particles. He demonstrates how the meaning of modal particles, being highly context-sensitive, is reflected in translation by highlighting the role of context.

The role of ideology in translation is investigated by Sabir Birot whose article shows how the media manipulate translation on the basis of the ideology and political agenda of their sponsor-publisher. The study aims at highlighting partiality of translation in the Kurdish media, and helps the target readership have awareness about the accuracy of the translation.

Language planning is the focus of the paper by Hilal Erkazanci Durmus with the translations of Hamlet as the data used to conduct the study. It attempts at describing how language planning influences literary translation from the perspective of social systems theory.

Gabriel González Núñez investigates the under-researched area of translation policy, specifically in terms of its relationship to the integration of minorities. He does so by considering the aims of translation in Wales' judiciary, healthcare and local government.

In the area of translator training, María del Mar Sánchez Ramos looks at the implications of social translation and ethics. Her paper focuses on the pedagogical interest in a globalized society. It provides an account on including a social translation module in a translation curriculum.

Ahmed AlKilabi's paper investigates another area in translator training, namely simultaneous interpreting. The study assesses the aptitude of university students for this kind of interpreting by using tests designed to measure essential skills and to elicit students' performance in the interpreting process.

Corpus-based methodology is used in Qiurong Zhao and Kefei Wang's article on the influence of translation on modern Chinese by focusing on reformulation markers. Following a chronological development of Chinese and the role played by translation in shaping its modern literary style, the authors use multiple corpora analysis, that is, a combination of comparable corpus, a parallel corpus and a reference corpus of translated Chinese and non-translated Chinese to illustrate the influence of translation and how reformulation markers changed.

Rozane Rodrigues Rebechi researches English equivalents for Portuguese Brazilian cooking vocabulary and discusses the implications of translation choices. She uses English and Brazilian Portuguese corpora of recipes to identify culturally marked Brazilian cooking terms and their



English equivalents, aiming at eventually compiling a bilingual glossary in the area.

Exploiting non-parallel corpora to improve named entity translations is the focus of the paper by Sellami, Sadat, and Belguith. They discuss the problem of mining named entity translations and present a new framework that helps extract named entities and their translations.

María Cristina Toledo Báez examines the use of translation technology and the role of automatic summarisation in the translation of research articles. A term-based summariser is used to enhance the quality and speed of the translation of specialized texts.

Problems of Arabic machine translation are investigated by Rached Zantout and Ahmed Guessoum. In particular, they discuss the issues of availability, building, and preparation of corpora. Their paper proposes the use of a neural network-based transfer module in a combination with a corpus-based approach.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my thanks to all authors for contributing to this volume as well as to all the reviewers for taking time to review the papers and provide the authors with very useful feedback.

SATTAR IZWAINI  
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF SHARJAH, UAE  
NOVEMBER 2014



## **PART I:**

# **TRANSLATION AND LINGUISTICS, IDEOLOGY, LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY**

# THE INFLUENCE OF CONTEXT ON THE TRANSLATION OF MODAL PARTICLES

STEVEN SCHOONJANS

KU LEUVEN/FWO-VLAANDEREN, BELGIUM

STEVEN.SCHOONJANS@ARTS.KULEUVEN.BE

## Abstract

The meaning of modal particles is known to be highly context-sensitive. This article shows how this is reflected in translation by highlighting the role of context in French translations of German particles. The notion of context is regarded from two different angles. On the one hand, reference is made to grammaticalization studies, in which contexts are classified depending on the degree of grammaticalization they suggest. On the other hand, context is interpreted as the particle's (textual and non-textual) environment inducing certain inferences and implicatures which may influence the meaning (and thus the translation) of the particle. A central issue in this discussion is where to draw the line between the particle's own meaning and context-induced nuances, as this determines the extent to which the proposed translation can be considered as a true equivalent of the German particle.

Keywords: Context, French, German, Modal Particles, Translation.

## 1. Introduction

A recurrent topic in discussions about German modal particles (MPs) is the description of their meanings. Despite growing consensus on the assumption that MPs have a (non-propositional) meaning, several issues remain unresolved. A typical example is the question of which terms are most appropriate to describe the meaning of particular MPs (cp. e.g. Rinas 2007 for an overview of the analyses of *ja*). Another issue is whether a minimalist or a maximalist method is more appropriate (cp. e.g. Hartmann 1986). Analyses of the former type assume that each particle has one core

meaning (which may be subject to context-induced variation or nuancing), whereas analyses of the latter type ascribe different meanings to the same particle. Diwald (2007: 133) notes that “at this point, a question which has long been discussed in particle research arises, namely when and on the basis of which criteria one should distinguish between polysemy and context-induced variation.”<sup>1</sup>

As Feyrer (1998: 69-70) indicates, these discussions are related to an important claim in particle research, viz. that MP meanings are highly context-determined. Accordingly, MPs only acquire their full semantic and pragmatic meaning when they are used in a particular context. This issue is not just of interest when studying German particles, but also when investigating how they are translated into other languages (cp. Feyrer 1998: 40). Indeed, if context influences the meaning of MPs, it is to be expected that different translation equivalents will be found for a single particle. The question needs to be asked, however, where the line between the particle’s own core meaning and context-induced nuances or implicatures has to be drawn, since this determines the extent to which the translation equivalent corresponds to the particle. If the translation mainly (or even only) conveys the context-induced nuance, the question arises if it is actually a translation equivalent of the particle, or just an explicit formulation of a nuance which is implicit in the source language.

The present paper addresses these issues on the basis of an analysis of French translations of German MPs. This analysis will be framed by a brief introduction into the issue of MP translation (§2), a few remarks on the notion of ‘context’ (§3), and some methodological comments (§4). The influence of the context on the translation is discussed in §5. This section consists of three parts, focusing first on the role played by elements from the purely linguistic context, or ‘cotext’ (§5.1), second on how the interpretation of the particle (and hence its translation) may be guided by the context as defined in grammaticalization studies (§5.2), and third on context-induced nuances which may be made explicit in the translation (§5.3). Finally, the extent to which these nuances are part of the meaning of the particle is discussed in §6.

## **2. MPs and their translation as context-sensitive phenomena**

The scope of the present paper does not allow for an elaborate presentation of the category ‘modal particle’ in German. Therefore, the focus will be on the meaning of the particles, since the meaning is the starting point for translation. The formal description will be brief; more detailed

presentations can be found in standard works on MPs, e.g. Franck (1980), Thurmair (1989), Autenrieth (2002), and Diewald (2007).

MPs are uninflected and usually unstressed words which cannot be negated or intensified, are integrated prosodically and syntactically into the utterance, have scope over the entire clause, and normally occur in the middle field (i.e. between the finite and infinite verb forms). Typical examples include *ja*, *doch*, *eben*, *halt*, *denn*, *schon*, *bloß*, *nur* etc.

- (1a) Was flüsterst du *denn* so? Das ist *doch* kein Geheimnis!  
(Why are you *denn* whispering? That's *doch* not a secret!)
- (1b) Wenn er *bloß* käme!  
(If he came *bloß*!)
- (1c) Männer sind *eben* so.  
(Men are *eben* like that)

MPs are used to mark the speaker's position towards the content of his utterance, how this content relates to the context, or how the hearer is expected to react. In the examples above, for instance, *denn* (1a) marks astonishment about the event referred to (the hearer's whispering) and *doch* indicates that this whispering seems to be a strange reaction given that it is not a secret (it indicates that the hearer may well change his behavior and speak up). *Bloß* (1b) causes an increase of the illocutionary force (a wish with *bloß* is stronger than one without the particle), whereas *eben* (1c) is used to mark the obviousness of what is said.

These meaning descriptions are somewhat simplistic, given that MPs do not simply refer to the context most of the time, but also gain their precise meaning only within a context. This is an important factor in explaining that it is often hard to find a direct counterpart of a particle in another language. Language pairs like German-French are interesting in this respect, as the former language clearly has more MPs (at both type and token frequency level) than the latter.<sup>2</sup>

In previous work, context has repeatedly been mentioned (e.g. by Feyrer 1998) as one of the factors explaining the variation in MP translations, but its actual role in translation has received little attention. Some scholars have referred to grammaticalization (e.g. Schoonjans and Feyaerts 2010), but without doing their analysis explicitly in terms of grammaticalization contexts. As for the purely linguistic context, reference has been made to an aspect of external syntax, viz. the illocution type (e.g. Feyrer 1998), but other cotextual features have to date hardly been studied in more detail. Therefore, the goal of the present paper is to offer an idea

of which role context may play, as an onset for more extended analyses of this phenomenon.

### 3. The notion of ‘context’

An important prerequisite for studying how context influences translation is a clear definition of the notion of ‘context’. This should not be taken for granted, as Goodwin and Duranti (1992: 2) indicate:

“[I]t does not seem possible at the present time to give a single, precise, technical definition of *context*, and eventually we might have to accept that such a definition may not be possible. At the moment the term means quite different things within alternative research paradigms, and indeed even within particular traditions seems to be defined more by situated practice, by *use* of the concept to work with particular analytic problems, than by formal definition.”<sup>3</sup>

Although this quote is about twenty years old, it still holds today. The term ‘context’ has indeed been used in different ways in linguistic studies so far, some of them being more general while others are related to a particular framework.

One of these particular uses of ‘context’ will be referred to in the analysis, viz. its use in grammaticalization studies. Several scholars have proposed a taxonomy of contexts in grammaticalization, depending on whether they favor the source meaning or the target meaning of the grammaticalizing form. This will be discussed in more detail below (§5.2). Most of the time, however, ‘context’ will be used in a more general way in the following. It will be used to refer to any linguistic or non-linguistic element in the situation in which the MP is used and which may play a role for its interpretation. A distinction will be made between what is purely linguistic (the so-called ‘cotext’) and what is not. The former (§5.1) includes the linguistic material surrounding the form under investigation, mostly in the same clause or utterance as the MP itself, but the adjacent clauses may be taken into account as well. The focus is thus on the presence or absence of particular linguistic elements or on the way a particular meaning is verbalized, not on the information conveyed by the linguistic surroundings of the particle, which is part of the situational context (§5.3).

The situational context includes all ideas, messages, concepts, situations and actions that are relevant to the interpretation of the MP. ‘Situational context’ is thus a very broad notion, as it includes not just features of the situation in which a clause is uttered, but also information

about socio-cultural, historical and geographical conditions. However, as Connolly et al. (2008: 52) indicate, including all this makes the concept of ‘context’ unworkable, and they advise to select those aspects of context which are relevant for the analysis. Therefore, in the following, the situational context will be restricted to what they call the ‘physical’ context (i.e. the speech situation), whereas the socio-cultural background will remain unconsidered.

#### **4. Methodological remarks**

MPs are usually considered a typical feature of colloquial speech. However, for lack of translation corpora of spoken language, written texts were used in which spoken language is reproduced. More precisely, I opted for a corpus of literary translations, consisting of 12 novels, 13 short stories, and 12 plays, each of them with one French translation (see bibliography). Each reference is accompanied by a three-letter abbreviation which is used for references for the examples in the article along with the page numbers in the source text and target text. In the case of ‘ele’, the version used is not the more famous opera version but the older drama version.

All translations were carried out by mother tongue speakers of French, to make sure that they are most familiar with the subtle nuances of the French expressions (and can thus choose the most appropriate translation). Furthermore, the texts were translated by different translators, to avoid skewing of the results due to personal preferences of the translators or to negligence or so-called ‘overtranslation’ (Métrich 1997: 149). Examples are given back translation in English between brackets. Back translations are my own, made on the basis of the German original, and have been added only to facilitate understanding.

#### **5. The influence of the context on the translation of MPs**

In the remainder of the paper, an impression will be given of how MP translation can be influenced by three kinds of context: cotext (§5.1), grammaticalization contexts (§5.2), and situational context (§5.3). The reason for putting the more specific use of ‘context’ in grammaticalization studies between the two aspects of a more general conception of context is that grammaticalization contexts actually refer to both linguistic and situational context, and thus constitute a link between the two.

It should be clear, however, that context is not the only factor that influences the choice of a translation equivalent. Personal preferences of



the translators certainly play a role as well (cp. §4 above), as do elements like genre, register, and style. The latter ones may in fact be related to some extent to context as well, but since they are less important for the interpretation of the MPs, they will not be considered any further.

### 5.1 The role of the cotext

The role of cotext for MP translation mainly pertains to the choice between omission and explicitation. It is the case indeed that a considerable amount of MPs is simply left out from the translations. Explanations in the literature include the non-propositional meaning of the particles, the degree of grammaticalization, the lack of direct counterparts, and the like. However, Métrich (1997), for instance, has shown that there is more to it. Among other things, he refers to the clause structure, claiming that MPs remain untranslated more often in subordinate clauses, as well as to verb types, indicating that the semantic aspect (aktionsart) may play a role in when and how MPs are translated.

There are other cotextual factors that are not mentioned by Métrich, but that seem to play a role as well. For instance, if the clause contains another element expressing the same or a similar nuance, the particle is less likely to be translated:

- (2) Und der Mensch, der *ja bekanntlich* schwierig ist? (mar 171)  
 Et l'être humain qui, *comme chacun sait*, est compliqué ? (213)  
 (And the human being, who is *ja as is well known* difficult?)

In this example, the German clause contains the MP *ja*, which indicates that the content of the clause may be known to the hearer. The particle is followed by the adverb *bekanntlich*, which conveys about the same meaning. This adverb appears in the French translation as *comme chacun sait* (as everyone knows), and the MP, which has a highly similar function, is omitted.

However, the functional similarity need not be this apparent. The German sentence in (3) contains the particle *denn*, which indicates that the question follows from something in the speech situation (typically an element in the preceding turn) the speaker is astonished at.<sup>4</sup> In (3), *denn* is accompanied by *zum Kuckuck*, which functions as a kind of illocutionary reinforcement. It is not entirely synonymous with *denn*, but can still be said to have a similar function, as the astonishment expressed by *denn* implies some kind of increase of the illocutionary force as well. *Zum*

*Kuckuck* is translated by a similar expression in French (*diable*), and this seems to be a reason for not translating the particle itself.

- (3) Wer, *zum Kuckuck*, ist *denn* das? (mjt 141)  
 Qui *diable* est cet individu ? (134)  
 (Who *on earth* is *denn* that?)

However, the relevant cotext frame is not necessarily restricted to the sentence containing the particle: if the preceding clause is uttered by the same speaker and contains an element with a similar function, the particle is also less likely to be translated. For instance, if the same MP occurs in consecutive sentences, translators often retain only one instantiation in the translation (usually the first one), as in (4), in which only the first *denn* is translated (by means of *donec*):

- (4) Sind Sie *denn* blind? Sehen Sie *denn* nicht, wie er dasitzt und schweigt und uns reden lässt? (mjt 135)  
 Seriez-vous *donec* aveugle ? Ne voyez-vous pas le baron qui se tait et nous laisse parler ? (128)  
 (Are you *denn* blind? Don't you *denn* see that he's just sitting there, silent, and lets us do the talking?)

The scope of the present paper does not allow for a more extended analysis of the influence of these (and other) cotextual factors, which would actually deserve a paper of their own. It should be clear, however, that the purely linguistic context (or 'cotext') should not be left unconsidered when studying the translation of MPs.

## 5.2 Grammaticalization contexts

Cotext is also important for the study of the grammaticalization processes from which MPs have originated. Grammaticalizing elements acquire new uses and gradually lose certain features of the original use. At the meaning level, this shows up in a dialectics of meaning persistence (or 'retention') and desemanticization, eventually accompanied by the acquisition of new meaning elements (typically recurring implicatures which become part of the actual meaning of the form).

A typical feature of grammaticalization is that it starts off in particular contexts, with the new use then spreading out gradually to other contexts. Several scholars (e.g. Diwald 2002 and Heine 2002) have proposed taxonomies of contexts, depending on whether they favor the original use

or the new use, or are neutral in this respect. Which readings are thought to be plausible depends on both linguistic and non-linguistic context, i.e. on both cotext and situational context.

Most relevant for the present study are the contexts in which the MP use is most plausible, although the original use can still shine through (i.e. Heine's 'bridging contexts' and Diewald's 'critical contexts'), as this may be reflected in translation. As an example, recall that *denn* is typically used to indicate that a question follows from some element in the speech situation which is unexpected to the speaker. This function is a trace of an older use of *denn*, viz. as a consecutive adverb.<sup>5</sup> In some contexts, this linking of the question to its context is still so clearly present that one may actually wonder whether we are dealing with the MP or with the consecutive adverb it stems from, as in (5):<sup>6</sup>

- |                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| (5) KLYTÄMNESTRA | Die Bräuche sag! Wie brächt ichs dar? Ich selber muss –<br>Dis-moi les rites ! Comment sacrifier ? Dois-je moi-même...  |
| ELEKTRA          | (Tell me the rites! How do I do it? I have to)<br>Nein. Diesmal gehst du nicht auf die Jagd mit Netz und Beil.<br>Non. Cette fois-ci ce n'est pas toi qui partiras en chasse avec un filet et une hache.<br>(No. This time, you don't go hunting with net and axe.) |
| KLYTÄMNESTRA     | Wer <i>denn</i> ? Wer bringt es dar? (ele 122)<br>Qui <i>alors</i> ? Qui accomplira le sacrifice ? (123)<br>(Who <i>denn</i> ? Who's going to do it?)   |

In this example, it is not clear at first sight whether *denn* is used as a MP marking astonishment about Electra's refutation, or as a consecutive adverb, meaning 'who then, if not me'. Given this ambiguity, it is not surprising that the translation actually contains a consecutive adverb (*alors* 'then'). There are however other cases in which it is less controversial that we are dealing with the MP *denn* in German, but which nevertheless have *alors* as a translation:

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| (6) BARBLIN | Andri – du bist keiner!<br>Mais, Andri, tu n'es pas juif.<br>(Andri – you're not a jew!) |
|-------------|--|

ANDRI            Warum willst du mich *denn* verstecken? (and 92)  
                      *Alors*, pourquoi veux-tu me cacher ? (160)  
                      (Why do you *denn* want to hide me?)

(7) ERNST    Ich weiß gar nicht, was schreiben.  
                      Je ne sais pas du tout quoi mettre.  
                      (I have no idea what to write)

OTTO        Warst du *denn* nicht da, als uns Affenschmalz die  
                      Disposition gab? (frü 54)  
                      *Alors* tu n'étais pas là quand Singegraisse nous a donné  
                      l'énoncé ? (74)  
                      (Weren't you *denn* there when Apelard gave us the  
                      assignment?)

In these examples, an interpretation of *denn* as a MP is at least plausible, although the context does not totally exclude retention, in that the consecutive meaning may still shimmer through. This consecutive meaning is made more prominent in the French translations, which again contain *alors*. Since *alors* makes explicit a meaning nuance which is present in German, it can be considered as a translation equivalent of *denn*, but this is due to the context, which allows for this consecutive nuance to show up.

Similar examples can be found for other particles. One of them is the self-evidence-marking particle *eben*. There is some discussion about its origin, but it has probably developed from the focus particle use of this form (Autenrieth 2002: 138f.). Typical translations of the focus particle *eben* are *précisément* and *justement*, and in cases where the focus particle meaning may still shine through, it is not uncommon to find such a translation:<sup>7</sup>

(8) Ja, freilich hat jemand den Ton angegeben, der Vater natürlich;  
       denn dass der Vater die Meinung bestimmt, das ist *eben* das  
       ' Richtige '. (mar 43)  
       Oui, certes, quelqu'un donnait le ton, le père naturellement; en  
       effet, que le père décide de l'opinion, c'est cela *justement* qui est  
       bon. (53)  
       (Yes, sure, someone gave the key, the father of course; because  
       the father deciding the opinion, that is *eben* the right thing.)

A third case is the particle *eigentlich*, which marks that the speaker switches to another (aspect of the) topic. It has developed from the

homophonous adverb, which means ‘really, actually’. As with *denn*, it is not always clear whether we are dealing with the adverb or the MP (here lies a disadvantage of using written texts: the prosody, which can sometimes disambiguate, is missing). Still there are cases in which a classification as a MP is at least plausible, but which have nevertheless been translated by means of an equivalent of the adverb, like *en fait*, *exactement*, or *au juste*, precisely because the context allows these meanings to be latently present.

- (9) Hier gibt es sicher keinen Satellitenempfang. Wo sind wir *eigentlich*? (aut 118)  
 Il n’y a certainement pas de chaînes par satellite. Où on est, *en fait*? (119)  
 (There’s definitely no satellite signal here. Where are we *eigentlich*?)
  
- (10) Möchte doch wissen, wozu wir *eigentlich* auf der Welt sind! (frü 11)  
 J’aimerais pourtant savoir pourquoi *au juste* nous sommes dans ce monde? (19)  
 (I’d like to know why we *eigentlich* are on this world!)
  
- (11) Um was handelt es sich *eigentlich*? (mjt 78)  
 De quoi s’agit-il, *exactement*? (75)  
 (What is it about *eigentlich*?)

Care has to be taken, however, when analyzing such examples, as it cannot be excluded that the French counterpart of the German source form is actually grammaticalizing and becoming a kind of MP itself. This is not that much the case with the examples above, but others can be found to which it certainly applies. One of them is *quand même* as a translation of *doch*. *Doch* marks that the content of the clause should be known to the hearer, but cannot be reconciled with the hearer’s assumptions or actions. It stems from the adverb *doch*, which means ‘nevertheless’ and which has *quand même* as a possible French translation. However, *quand même* itself is also undergoing a process of grammaticalization, in the same direction as *doch*, and can in some contexts be used as a MP, corresponding more or less to the German MP *doch* (cp. Waltereit 2006: 77). An example is (12), in which *quand même* is not only used as the translation of *doch*, but shows striking similarities to it as well (middle field positioning, bleached meaning when compared to the original adverb, etc.).

- (12) So kannst du dich *doch* nicht ins Auto setzen! (hit 163)  
 Tu ne peux *quand même* pas prendre le volant dans cet état !  
 (155)  
 (You can't *doch* step into a car like this!)

Similar cases include *seulement* as a translation for *nur* (originally a focus particle) and *simplement* for *einfach* (originally a modal adverb), which both seem to evolve towards MP status, like their German counterparts:

- (13) Wenn *nur* nicht dieses unerträgliche Zischen des Vaters gewesen wäre! (ver 70)  
 Si *seulement* il n'y avait pas eu ces sifflements insupportables du père ! (71)  
 (If *nur* there hadn't been this unbearable hissing by his father!)
- (14) Vielleicht hat das alles *einfach* gar nichts mit dir zu tun. (aut 136)  
 Peut-être que tout ça n'a *simplement* rien à voir avec toi, rien du tout. (137)  
 (Maybe all of this has *einfach* nothing to do with you at all.)

It thus turns out that, although the French counterparts of the German particles may grammaticalize and become MPs as well, one does regularly retrieve the source form in the translations. This is mainly the case if the context allows for it, i.e. if retention is not excluded by the context or if the context is ambiguous between the reading as a MP and the older reading. How frequently this occurs also depends on the degree of grammaticalization: the further the particle is grammaticalized, the weaker the retention is and the less likely it is to influence the choice of a translation equivalent. However, the importance of this factor should not be underestimated: for less grammaticalized particles like *eigentlich*, up to a third of the occurrences are translated by means of a counterpart of the adverb (Schoonjans and Feyaerts 2010).

### 5.3 Influence of the situational context

The role of the situational context is not restricted to grammaticalization contexts, however. It is possible indeed that a particular context-induced (and thus implicit) interpretation of the clause containing the particle, or of the particle itself (be it an implication or an implicature), is made explicit in translation.<sup>8</sup> This contextual influence can be found at both the level of

the particle meaning and its discourse function. In the former case, the nuance expressed by the particle is modified, or a supplementary nuance is added, whereas in the latter case, the way in which the particles relate the clause to the context (i.e. what Thurmair 1989 calls the <KONNEX> function of the particles) is at stake. This is indeed something most particles do: they indicate that there is a link with what precedes, but usually without specifying the nature of this link. However, under influence of the context, it may be inferable what kind of link it is, and this may be made explicit in the translation. Both cases (meaning and discourse function) will be discussed in the following.

A first example of context influencing meaning is found in (15). The German clause contains the particle *denn*, which was said above to mark that the question follows from astonishment about something in the context. In (15), this nuance may even be stronger than simple astonishment: within the context, it seems that the speaker actually wants to express disbelief, viz. about the fact that something has to be done 'here and now'. This nuance of disbelief, which is a strengthened variant of the meaning of *denn*, is context-induced in German, but is made explicit in French, by means of *vraiment*, an adverb which can be used precisely to express disbelief (see Schoonjans and Feyaerts 2010).

- (15) Bedenken Sie doch, wo wir sind! Muss das *denn* jetzt geschehen und gerade hier? (mjt 59)  
 Songez à l'endroit où vous vous trouvez ! Faut-il *vraiment* que cela se fasse maintenant, et de plus ici ? (58)  
 (Bear in mind where we are! Does this *denn* have to happen now, and furthermore here?)

A variant of the disbelief nuance can be found in example (16) below. In this example, Jan seems to suggest that Anna is a fool. Anna is astonished and even indignant at this claim, and it is clear from the context that a negative answer is what Anna wants, since she does not consider herself to be foolish. This expectation of a negative answer is implicit in German (*denn* only marks the astonishment), but it is made explicit in French. Possible ways of expressing in German that a negative answer is wanted are *etwa* and *doch nicht*, and precisely *doch nicht* is what is found in the translation: *quand même* combined with a negation.

- (16) JAN      Du machst wohl nie was einfach so.  
                  Visiblement tu ne fais jamais rien simplement comme ça.  
                  (You probably never do anything just like that.)

ANNA    Ja bin ich *denn* des Wahnsinns? (bvn 116)  
           Je *ne* suis *quand même pas* folle ! (117)  
           (Yeah have I *denn* gone mad?)

The final example contains a synonym of *quand même*, viz. *tout de même*. As mentioned, these forms are direct counterparts of German *doch*. However, the German sentence in (17) contains *ja* instead of *doch*. Both particles are similar in that they indicate that the content of the clause can be considered as true and may be known to the hearer. Still, *doch* is somewhat stronger: it also indicates that this is somehow irreconcilable with the hearer's actions or apparent assumptions, and that these should therefore be modified in order to fit in with what is said. The German clause in (17) contains the weaker particle *ja*, yet within the context, it is clear that the speaker aims at a correction of the hearer's assumptions. Therefore, it is not astonishing that *ja* gets translated by means of a counterpart of *doch*, viz. *tout de même*.

- (17) [Situation: When coming home, Sonia asks why there is no tea. Lucas replies that he cannot make her tea by the time she comes home if he does not know when she arrives.]  
       Ich kann *ja* nicht alle fünf Minuten Pfefferminzblätter rein- und raustun! (caf 114)  
       Je ne peux *tout de même* pas mettre des feuilles de menthe à infuser toutes les cinq minutes ! (115)  
       (I can't *ja* put in peppermint leaves every five minutes!)

As for the contextual influence at the discourse-functional level, the clearest examples are those in which a MP is translated by a connective. The connective then explicitly marks the <KONNEX>, i.e. the link with what precedes, and usually is more explicit about the nature of this link than the MP. This is where the context comes in. If something is said to be true, evident, or undeniable (e.g. by using a particle like *ja*, *doch*, or *eben*), it can be used as an explanation for some other phenomenon. Within a context, it is often clear indeed that a clause containing one of these particles offers an explanation for what was said before. The <KONNEX> link can thus be interpreted as a causal one, and this may be made explicit in French by using a conjunction from this domain, e.g. *car* or *puisque*,<sup>9</sup> or by means of *en effet*, a typical explanation marker (Grieve 1996: 254; Nøjgaard 1992: §204f.):



- (18) Man kann dich nicht zerschlagen, du bist *ja* nur Eines. (glg 178)  
 On ne peut pas te briser, *car* tu es un. (179)  
 (You cannot be crushed, you are *ja* in one piece.)
- (19) Mein Blick fiel auf die gepackten Koffer, die noch immer im Zimmer standen, ich hatte *ja* verreisen wollen. (mjt 153)  
 Mon regard tomba sur les malles qui étaient restées dans la chambre *puisque* j'avais l'intention de partir en voyage. (146)  
 (My eye fell on the packed suitcases that were still in the room, I wanted *ja* to travel.)
- (20) Zur Bezeichnung solcher Unfähigkeiten verwendet man heute das Wort Frustration, wobei von allen Frustrationen die sexuelle ohne Zweifel die tödlichste ist. Diese Frustration ist *eben* ethischer Natur, denn sie betrifft die Ehre des Menschen. (mar 194)  
 On emploie aujourd'hui, pour désigner de telles incapacités, le mot frustration, la frustration sexuelle étant, sans aucun doute, la plus funeste de toutes. Cette frustration est *en effet* de nature éthique, car elle touche à l'honneur de l'être humain. (243)  
 (To describe such incapability, one uses the word frustration nowadays, where of all frustrations the sexual one beyond any doubt is the deadliest one. This frustration is *eben* of an ethical nature, as it concerns the honor of mankind.)

The causal or explanatory link is the most typical example of a context-induced specification of <KONNEX> in the translation. Other examples can be found, but care has to be taken not to confound context-induced specifications of the <KONNEX> link with traces of retention. An example is the use of *alors* as a translation of *denn* (cp. §5.2 above). In these cases, it is indeed a <KONNEX> link which is made explicit in the translation, viz. a consecutive link. The fact that it is a consecutive link, however, is due to retention (*denn* developed from a consecutive adverb). Hence, it is not a context-induced interpretation of the combination of <KONNEX> and the particle's meaning in the same way as when *ja* is translated by *puisque*, because *ja* does not have cause-marking ancestors. Hence, in the latter case, it is just the context that causes the specific interpretation of <KONNEX>, whereas in the case of *denn*, the diachrony is at stake as well. This distinction should not be neglected, and it should be clear that both situational context and diachrony can bring about a more specific interpretation of the <KONNEX> link.

## 6. Discussion

In the preceding sections, it has been shown in which ways context may play a role in the translation of MPs. One important question remains, however: can we say that all French counterparts mentioned above – including conjunctions such as *puisque* – are real translation equivalents of German MPs?

A first element in the answer is that, in order to say that a linguistic form is a translation of another one, there has to be some correspondence, either at the meaning level or at the <KONNEX> level. This is the case in all examples mentioned above: in all cases, the translation can be linked to the German particle by referring to its meaning or to its <KONNEX> function (or both).

From a literary point of view, this may be sufficient to claim that we are dealing with translation equivalents. However, the question remains whether they are true linguistic equivalents. This leads to another question, viz. whether the contextual meanings are actually part of the meaning of the German particles. If they are not, then one might ask whether the French elements under investigation are not translations of something contextual, rather than of the particles.

The discussion of where to draw the line between what is part of the particle's core meaning and what is context is a vivid one. Causal *ja* (18-19) is a good example in this respect. Knetschke (1974), for instance, claims that in such cases where it is used in an explanation, *ja* is not a MP but a causal conjunction. Most other scholars take less extreme positions. Rudolph (1986), for instance, claims that *ja* is a MP which can, next to its core meaning (truth, familiarity), also mark that we are dealing with a justification. Similarly, Karagjosova (2003) argues that *ja* simply marks that what is said should be known to the hearer and that it creates a <KONNEX> link. That this link is causal is not part of the particle's meaning, but is a purely contextual implicature.

Which analysis is better is hard to tell at first sight, since in this case, we are dealing with a recurrent implicature. The problem with such recurrent implicatures is that they may become part of the meaning of a form (see e.g. Brinton and Traugott 2005: 29). However, it is hard to tell at which point they have become part of the meaning, yet this seems to be unproblematic for the study of translation. The reason is that MPs can hardly be described without referring to the contexts in which they are used.

As pointed out above, the precise meaning or nuance of MPs is context-dependent. Hence, determining what precisely the particle means

is impossible without taking the context into account. This idea is compatible with more general claims about the relation between meaning and context. Linell (2009: 16f.), for instance, claims that relevant contexts cannot be singled out from meanings and vice-versa. Similarly, Langacker (2001) states that linguistic units cannot be separated totally from the usage events in which they are realized. In other words: a form cannot be studied without looking at its usage contexts, as the way it is used is simply part of the form.

Implicatures are closely linked to context (since they are context-induced), and hence to usage. Taking implicatures into account for translation and even making them explicit thus simply amounts to showing how the form is used in the source language. The core meaning may be different, but the translation reflects how the form is used in the original text. If the German MP is turned into a causal conjunction in the French translation, then this shows that the particle is used in German in such a way that it has some similarities with a causal conjunction. Distinguishing between nuances that are part of the invariant core meaning of the particle and context-induced nuances may thus not be inevitable when analyzing how a particle is translated, since what is translated is actually the use of the particle, and all nuances, be they context-induced or not, are part of the way the particle is used.

This is not to say that all distinctions between invariant core meaning and contextual variation or implicatures are useless. Such distinctions can be relevant for analyses of MPs, and may even be interesting as a starting point when analyzing the different translations that can be found for them. Similarly, I do not claim that no distinction can be made between direct translation counterparts and other translations in which a contextual nuance is added or which differ in some other way from the translated form. This seems to be a matter of the degree of equivalence, which is not at stake in the present discussion. The point is that the way a form is used and the way it is translated cannot simply be detached from one another, as the use plays a role for the translation. Both core meaning and meaning-in-context are part of the use of a form, and both influence the translation.

## **7. Conclusion**

In the preceding discussion, it has been shown that context plays a role in the translation of MPs. This is not surprising, given that MPs only gain their precise meaning within a situational context. However, linguistic context and particular types of context (e.g. contexts as defined in grammaticalization studies) turn out to influence the choice of a translation

equivalent as well. The argumentation was illustrated with relevant examples, but an extended (quantitative) analysis of all the potential contextual influences could not be undertaken within the scope of the present paper.

A major reason for this is that another issue had to be dealt with first, viz. the question whether translations in which context-induced nuances are made explicit can be considered as translation equivalents of the particles. The answer argued for is positive, as long as there is a clear link with the particle, either at the meaning level or regarding the <KONNEX> function of the particle. The distinction between context-induced nuances and the core meaning of the particle turned out to be of lesser importance for translation studies such as the present one, since what is translated is not actually the particle as such but a use of the particle. The context in which a particle is used and the implicatures this context brings about cannot be disregarded when looking at the use of the particle. Thus, if a translation makes an implicature explicit, this means that it shows how the particle is used in the original text. Hence, some of the translations dealt with may not be true direct counterparts of the particles themselves in a strict sense, but if usage is taken into account, they can all be classified as translations of the respective particles.

As far as we are aware, there are no translation analyses yet in which context is systematically taken into account. It is sometimes referred to (e.g. by Feyrer 1998) to explain the diversity of translation equivalents that can be found, and eventually to explain how a particular translation relates to a particle, but this is not done in a systematic way most of the time. It should be clear from the preceding discussion, however, that context is an important factor in the choice of translation equivalents of MPs. Both linguistic and situational context have been shown to play a role at different levels. What precisely the relative importance of the different contextual influences hinted at is, had to remain unanswered, but this is an obvious next step to take in the investigation of the role of context for particle translation.

## Acknowledgment

Special thanks to Geert Brône, an anonymous reviewer and the editor for useful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

## Notes

1. My translation, S.S.
2. Earlier work on German-French MP translations includes Weydt (1969), Burkhardt (1995), Métrich (1997, 2000), Feyrer (1998), Schoonjans and Feyaerts (2010), Schoonjans and Lauwers (2010), and Schoonjans (2013), among others.
3. Italics in the original. Goodwin and Duranti (1992) also offer an overview of the ways in which the notion of ‘context’ is used in different frameworks and theories.
4. An anonymous reviewer suggests that “this is the case of most questions, so that *denn* only reinforces the standard features of an interrogative sentence.” It is true that *denn* entertains some kind of illocutive strengthening, as will be shown on example (3). However, it does not seem to me that “most” questions are actually raised by astonishment (although questions with *denn* typically are).
5. In present-day standard German, *dann* is mostly used instead of *denn* as the consecutive adverb.
6. An anonymous reviewer suggests that “a consecutive adverb in a question necessarily presents it at the consequence of something astonishing” and that therefore, “there is no reason to oppose the consecutive adverb and the MP.” It is admittedly true that this use of consecutive *denn* typically implies some astonishment; this is precisely the implicature which gave rise to its grammaticalization from a consecutive adverb to a MP. Nevertheless, both uses have to be kept apart, as the consecutive adverb can be used without astonishment nuance (cp. also note 4), whereas the modal particle marks the question as following from something in the speech situation but without necessarily implying that a consequence is asked for, as in (3) above. The reviewer makes a similar remark about the distinction between the adverbial and the MP use of *eigentlich* in (9-11). Once again, this is related to the fact that the MP has developed from the adverb, and the issue has been discussed in the literature before (e.g. Oppenrieder and Thurmair 1989).
7. An anonymous reviewer indicates that *justement* and *précisément* can also have a global scope, which brings them closer to MP *eben*.
8. It cannot be excluded that implicatures of the kind dealt with here become part of the ‘normal’ meaning of the form, making the contexts at stake new bridging contexts in a next step of grammaticalization. Still these examples differ from those in section 5.2 in that in none of them, the possibility for the source form from which the MP developed to shimmer through is at stake, which was the central issue in §5.2.
9. That precisely *car* and *puisque* are used, rather than *parce que*, fits in with the traditional view that these conjunctions are used when the cause or explanation is already known to the hearer (although this is a somewhat simplistic account, cp. Zufferey 2012).

## References

- Autenrieth, T. 2002. *Heterosemie und Grammatikalisierung bei Modalpartikeln*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Brinton, L.J. and E.C. Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burkhardt, A. 1995. Zur Übersetzbarkeit von Abtönungspartikeln (on the translatability of modal particles). *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik*, 23:2. 172-201.
- Connolly, J.H., A. Chamberlain and I.W. Phillips. 2008. An Approach to Context in Human-Computer Communication. *Semiotica*, 169. 45-70.
- Diewald, G. 2002. A Model for Relevant Types of Contexts in Grammaticalization. In: I. Wischer and G. Diewald (eds), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 103-120.
- Diewald, G. 2007. Abtönungspartikel (downtoning particles). In: L. Hoffmann (ed.), *Handbuch der Deutschen Wortarten* (handbook of German word classes). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 117-141.
- Feyrer, C. 1998. *Modalität in Kontrast* (modality in contrast). Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Franck, D. 1980. *Grammatik und Konversation* (grammar and conversation). Königstein/Taunus: Scriptor.
- Goodwin, C. and A. Duranti. 1992. Rethinking Context: An Introduction. In: A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context: Language as An Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-42.
- Grieve, J. 1996. *Dictionary of Contemporary French Connectors*. London: Routledge.
- Hartmann, D. 1986. Context Analysis or Analysis of Sentence Meaning? On Modal Particles in German. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10. 543-557.
- Heine, B. 2002. On The Role of Context in Grammaticalization. In: I. Wischer and G. Diewald (eds), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 83-101.
- Karagjosova, E. 2003. Modal Particles and The Common Ground. In: P. Kühnlein, H. Rieser and H. Zeevat (eds), *Perspectives on Dialogue in the New Millennium*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 335-350.
- Knetschke, E. 1974. Die Funktion der Partikel *ja* in Tonbandaufnahmen deutscher Umgangssprache (the function of the particle *ja* in tape recordings of German colloquial speech). *Phonai*, Beiheft 2. 89-109.
- Langacker, R.W. 2001. Discourse in Cognitive Grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12. 143-188.